



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

NOTES.

ON GREEK AND LATIN NEGATIVES.

1. *Latin haud* : *Greek οὐ*.

The explanations of Latin *haud* and Greek *οὐ* offered by Horton-Smith in volume XVIII of this Journal and the same scholar's explanation of *ἀνεν* mentioned in the same article, and more fully developed in B. B. 22, 189 ff., are, it seems to me, open to some objections.

Whatever may be the true etymological explanation of Lat. *haud* and Gr. *οὐ*, it is certain that their negative meaning is an acquired one, and it is probable that the development of each took place separately. Hence the fact that the same meaning attaches to the words has no great bearing upon the question of their etymological connection.

All four forms—*au hau haud haut*—existed, but I confess an inability to see that Horton-Smith has made a case for *au* as the original Latin form. The fact that the earliest occurrence happens to be *hau* proves nothing. There is evidence for both *haut* and *haud* in the inscriptions and for all three forms in the manuscripts of the earliest authors. Statements of the Grammarians, having in mind, as they did, the Gr. *οὐ*, are to be looked on with suspicion.

It is very difficult to see how *sed* could cause the addition of *-d* to *hau* by analogy. Negatives may exert an influence upon one another, as may adversative conjunctions, and so on; but how a negative could be influenced by an adversative conjunction it is impossible to conceive. The case is no better for the supposed influence of the ablative *-d*. In neither case is there a point of contact that would permit the working of analogy. The opposing view must be supported by a number of certain examples.

Doubt is cast on Horton-Smith's theory that Lat. *(h)au(d)* is from I.E. *ou* by the somewhat dubious character of Thurneysen's law when applied to the *o* of the *e : o* ablaut series. (Cf. Brugmann, Grundriss, I², §163, Anm. See, however, Hirt, Ablaut, §35, Anm.)

In view of the large number of cases of non-etymological *h*-, there can be no objection to assuming with Horton-Smith that the initial of *haud* is 'vorgeschoben,' and so I also have explained it in my treatment of the word (Negatives of the Indo-European Languages). In that discussion I started with the form *au-l(i)* (identical with the conjunction *aut*), which has various congeners: Skr. *ō*, Gr. *αὖ*, Lat. *au-tem*, Osc. *av-ti*, Umbr. *u-te*, Goth. *auh*, O.H.G. *ouh*. The original meaning as indicated by these words was 'further, again,' or a still more general intensive force. The Lat. *autem* is itself occasionally employed as an intensive in Plautus; e. g. Pseud. 305, Amph. 901. Those negatives concerning whose semantic history there is certainty have acquired their meaning through use as intensives to other negatives (cf. now Bréal, *Essai sémantique*, chapitre 21). It is probable that (*h*)*aut* received its meaning in this way. The particle *aut*, on the one hand, took on the conjunctive use and meaning; on the other was used as an intensive to a negative, and thence became a negative adverb. That the non-etymological *h*- became permanently attached to the negative was due partly at least to the need felt for a formal distinction between adverb and conjunction. It would not be strange, then, if we should find, occasionally, *haud* used, not as an independent negative, but just as *pas* commonly in French. Instances of this use we have, possibly, in the *neque haud* in Plautus and elsewhere. So-called double negatives are only possible when the negatives have different applications, which probably is not the case in the *neque haud* sentences. For example, see Plautus, Persa 535 *Neque mihi haud imperito eveniet*.

The interchange of *-t* and *-d*, whether it is due, in the first place, to assimilation to initials of following words or whether it is altogether an orthographical confusion, is explained as easily under the supposition of an original *-t* as of an original *-d*. The form *hau* arose through the dropping of the *-d* after the long-vowel sound.

The comparative infrequency of the form *haut* on the inscriptions speaks somewhat against my explanation; but the occurrence of the word in any form is rare on the inscriptions. On the other hand, the advantages of my explanation are: (1) that the explanation of a final consonant is a far more probable one, (2) that a connection is made with an I.E. particle capable of being used as an intensive, and not with a verbal root, and (3) the development of meaning supposed is one that can be illustrated

elsewhere; while for the development supposed by Horton-Smith we have no example; we know of no full-fledged negative adverb that has developed its negative meaning in that way.

In the case of Gr. *οὐ* the last two considerations should have weight; that is, we should, if possible, connect this negative with an I.E. particle and suppose a development similar to that which has taken place in the case of French *pas*.

Whatever else may be said of the *-χι* and *-κι* of the Greek negative (cf. now Brugmann, Gr. Gr., pp. 117, 244), certainly it is not necessary to suppose that when they were added to *οὐ* they had the force of 'this.' Much more probable is it that they had an indefinite intensive force.

It is quite generally held that the initial syllable of Gr. *ἀνευ* contains the negative (cf. Brugmann, Gr. Gr., §516); but that the final syllable ever had a negative or 'quasi-negative' force in the compound, as held by Horton-Smith (B. B. 22, 190), is impossible, for the reason mentioned above—that a double negative can not exist unless the negatives have separate applications. One negative applied to another does not strengthen it, but destroys it.

2. Latin *nihil nīl*.

Fay (A. J. P. 18, 462) explains *nihil nīl* as from a **ne-hi-elum*. To be sure, a Latin *hīlum* is not attested by many examples, but certainly those given by Forcellini can not be all fictions. In regard to the example in Ennius it must be remembered that the first syllable of the word in his time was *nī-* (An. 170 and *nīl*, Fab. 197, Mueller). There would be something more than tmesis carried to the extreme in the writing of *neque* (or *nec*) *dispendi facit hīlum* for *nihilumque dispendi facit*. Fay's cognates of **elum* I do not discuss, except to call attention to the fact that Czerep, in Archiv, XI 583, claims that *elementum* is a Semitic loan-word.

LOMBARD COLLEGE, GALESBURG, ILL.

FRANK H. FOWLER.

ON THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF I SAMUEL 20. 3 AND EPISTLE OF JEREMIAH 26.

I Samuel 20. 3. For *μὴ οὐ βούληται* read *μὴ λυπηται*. The proposed reading is an exact translation of the present Hebrew text, *לֹא יִצְעַב* 'lest he be grieved.' The same verb is rendered by